

**RECEIVED**  
**CENTRAL FAX CENTER**  
**AUG 21 2007**

**LAW OFFICES OF**  
**McGINN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP, PLLC**

A PROFESSIONAL LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY  
PATENTS, TRADEMARKS, COPYRIGHTS, AND INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW  
8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD, SUITE 200  
VIENNA, VIRGINIA 22182-3817  
TELEPHONE: (703) 761-4100  
FACSIMILE/DATA: (703) 761-2375; 761-2376  
E-MAIL: MCGINNGIBB @ AOL.COM / ADMIN @ MCGINNIPLAW.COM  
SENDER'S E-MAIL: FCO OPERRIDER @ MCGINNIPLAW.COM

SEAN M. MCGINN  
PHILLIP E. MILLERL  
FREDERICK E. COOPERRIDERL  
SCOTT M. TULINO  
DONALD J. LECHERL  
PETER F. MCGEEL  
DONALD A. DIPALUAL  
MEMBER OF BAR OTHER THAN VA

August 21, 2007

**VIA FACSIMILE**  
**(Total No. of Pages Transmitted: 28)**

To: Examiner Vicary  
Group Art Unit No. 2183

Facsimile No.: (571) 273-8300/270-2314

From: Frederick E. Cooperrider

Facsimile No.: (703) 761-2375 or 76


Re: Slides for Telephone Interview  
U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/671,889  
Attorney Docket No. YOR.464

Examiner Vicary:


Enclosed are powerpoint slides to be discussed at today's telephone interview at 2:00. To join in the conference call, please dial 866-867-8308, then enter passcode 4192240 followed by # sign. If you have trouble joining the telephone interview, please call my office number at 703-761-4100.

Thank you in advance for your kind consideration on this case.

Very truly yours,

  
Frederick E. Cooperrider  
Registration No. 36,769

FEC/fec  
Enclosure



# Patent Application 10/671,889 aka 170

Fred Gustavson

IBM Research

August 6, 2007

# Overview of Talk

- Respond to OAS of 7/16/07
- 2 to 26(a. to d.): double patenting
  - preloading and pre-fetching are different
- 27-41(e. to j.) : 112 rejections
- 42-46(k. to l.) : 101 rejections
- 47-58: 102 rejections

# Overview of Talk continued

- 59 to 63: response to 6/17/07 arguments
- 64-66(m.) : Conclusions
  - new Gustavson reference of 1994 refers to L2 algorithmic pre-fetching
  - this patent refers to new forms of L3 pre-fetching

# Overview of Talk continued

- Try to resolve issues before we produce a second Amendment (called A from now on)
  - ☐ can we resolve any rejected 101 claims?
  - ☐ can we resolve any rejected 112 claims?
  - ☐ can we resolve any rejected 102 claims?
  - ☐ can we resolve double patenting claim?

# Attached Floating Point Units 1.

- L1 is not directly attached to L0
  - L0 is the register file of FPU
- data must arrive in L1 that is optimal for loading into L0
- pre-fetching get data to L1
- pre-loading get data to L0
- non-optimal and optimal cases for L1 to L0

# Attached Floating Point Units 2

- multiple load instructions
  - quad loads done twice as fast as double loads
  - data for quad loads must be contiguous
- multiple loads not part of Gustavson 1998
- pre-fetching does no good unless quad loads can be used
- standard data structures cannot be used for multiple loads
- register blocking of co-pending patent ..888 is required for use of multiple loads

# Attached Floating Point Units 3

- standard data structures requires  $2NB + MB$  pre-fetch streams
  - typical values are  $NB=MB=4$  or  $6$
- some processors do not provide 12 or 18 pre-fetch hardware streams
  - IBM BG/L processor is an example
- with register blocking the number of such streams is 3 which is minimal for matrix multiply
- register blocking with minimum number of pre-fetch streams is not in Gustavson references



# Double Patenting Issues 1.

- Even for some older machines without an attached FPU there was a distinction between pre-fetching and preloading
- We now concentrate only on newer machines since the Gustavson references
- consider using standard data structures so that data arrives in L1 that cannot use multiple loads

# Double Patenting Issues 2.

- one must use multiple loads which will be incorrect for the application of matrix multiply
- some processors allow FPU register load instructions that can be overlapped with FPU multiple operations
  - this is a case where a new form of pre-loading can be utilized
- this new form of pre-loading is not covered in the Gustavson references

## Items 2 to 26 discussions: 5. i

- Item 5: do you now see a distinction between pre-fetching & preloading?
  - pre-fetching gets data into L1
  - data may not be contiguous for multiple load instructions
  - must use multiple load instructions to get peak FPU performance

## Items 2 to 26 discussions: 5. ii


- pre-loading uses overlapping load instructions of the FPU unit
  - different from multiple load instructions of the load store unit of a processor
  - incorrectly loaded data by multiple load instructions is corrected by using overlapping load instructions of the FPU unit
- above procedure is a new form of pre-loading not described in the Gustavson references

## Items 2 to 26 discussions: 5. iii

- current 5 i, ii, slides are novel and not obvious to one skilled in the art.
- a. of OAS: agreed; however, there are specifics here that disallow these teachings on some processors

# Items 27 to 41 discussions: 29

- did not understand this item

- 
- Items 27 to 41 discussions: 33**
- our patent only addresses L3 pre-fetching
  - we think this is not new matter

## Items 27 to 41 discussions: 34

- could remove if Examiner Vicary (EV) is adamant



## Items 27 to 41 discussions: 38

- we will say we decrease time but only at the cost of increasing effort
- with new more specific claims item 38 may become moot

Items 27 to 41 discussions: 39:41

■ we agree with EV's comments

**Items 42 to 46 discussions: 42:46**

- we agree with EV's comments

## Items 47 to 58 discussions: 48

- Gustavson only gives general guidelines
- the current invention is about new forms of algorithmic pre-fetching not covered in Gustavson
- these new forms apply recent new processors which did not exist at the time when Gustavson was published

## Items 47 to 58 discussions: 49

- new claim 1. will be specific to the new forms of pre-fetching

## Items 47 to 58 discussions: 50

- multiple loads of a special type need to be overcome
- the Gustavson paper does not discuss this aspect of the current invention
- new claim 1 will address how this new aspect can be handled

**Items 47 to 58 discussions: 51:58**

■ see discussion of item 50

# Items 59 to 63 discussions: 60

- new specific claims will address this objection
- see slides 5 to 9 of this presentation



# Items 59 to 63 discussions: 61

- new claim(s) will address EV's objection

## Items 59 to 63 discussions: 62

- new claim(s) will address EV's objection
- could not find Linear Algebra compiler references in the Gustavson references
- see pages 11 and 12 of the 6/19/07 amendment which are re-stated in slides 5 to 9 of this presentation

## Items 59 to 63 discussions: 63

- lines 3 to 7 of item 7 will be incorporated into the new set of claims

## Items 64 to 66 discussions: 64 m.

- the reason any conventional compiler cannot be a linear algebra (LA) compiler is that an array is not a matrix. this fact is not in the new Gustavson reference B.
- any claim about a LA compiler will not be obvious from reference B.
- reference B refers to L2 pre-fetching. this invention is about L3 pre-fetching